

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant sincerely thanks Examiners Price and Thomson for conducting a telephonic interview with Applicant's representatives, David W. Foster and Robert G. Hartman, on September 5, 2007. Applicant also sincerely thanks Examiner Price for conducting a second interview with David W. Foster and Robert G. Hartman on September 12, 2007.

During the interviews, Applicant's agent submitted differences between the combination of "Programming with the Java Media Framework", Sullivan et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,038,625 to Ogino et al., and the claimed subject matter. Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting allowance of the application and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant's representatives proposed to amend each of the independent claims to further highlight features of Applicant's claims. Specifically, Applicant's representatives proposed amending independent claim 1 to recite the features previously found in dependent claim 6. During the second interview, Applicant's representatives understood Examiner Price to agree that each of the proposed amendments would at least overcome the outstanding rejections based on Sullivan and Ogino. Examiner Price also indicated that he would need to update his search.

Accordingly, the independent claims are amended herein, as discussed during the interview.

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 46 are currently amended. Claims 2-6 are canceled. Accordingly, claims 1 and 7-47 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and that the application be forwarded onto issuance.

The Claim Rejections

Claims 1-5, 7-14, 17-26, 28-36 and 39-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by “Programming with the Java Media Framework”, Sullivan et al. (hereinafter “Sullivan”).

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan.

Claims 6, 37 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,038,625 to Ogino et al. (hereinafter “Ogino”).

Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,574,934 to Mirashrafi et al. (hereinafter Mirashrafi).

The Claims

Claim 1, as amended, recites a system comprising (emphasis added):

- one or more computer-readable media;
- an application program interface embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and which can be utilized to present a presentation;

- the application program interface comprising:
- a plurality of *open* methods that can be called by an application, the open methods comprising a parameter for specifying a destination for the presentation, and at least a parameter for specifying a data source for the presentation; wherein collectively, the parameters for specifying a data source enable data sources to be specified in different manners, *wherein said one parameter for specifying a data source specifies a topology object that defines transforms to be used in the presentation*;
- a method for ascertaining the state of a media engine that causes the presentation to be presented;
- a method for ascertaining capabilities of the media engine;
- a method to start processing media samples that are the subject of the presentation;
- a method to stop processing media samples; and
- a method to pause media sample processing.

In making out a rejection of this claim before its amendment, the Office argues that the subject matter is anticipated by Sullivan. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance, this claim has been amended to recite features originally present in dependent claim 6. Applicant notes that the Office argues that dependent claim 6 is rendered obvious over Sullivan in view of Ogino.

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that neither Sullivan or Ogino disclose or suggest a "plurality of *open* methods ... the open methods comprising a parameter for ... specifying a data source for the presentation ... wherein said one parameter for specifying a data source specifies *a topology object* that defines *transforms* to be used in the presentation", as recited in Applicant's claim (emphasis added). During the above-referenced interview, the Office agreed that

neither reference discloses or suggests such an element. Applicant once again thanks the Office for its input.

For at least this reason, this claim stands allowable.

Claims 7-45 depend from claim 1 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 1 apply equally to these claims. The rejections of these claims are also improper as failing to show these claims' own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are not shown to be taught or suggested, either singly or in combination, in the references of record.

Claim 46 recites a system comprising (emphasis added):

- one or more computer-readable media;
- an application program interface embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and which can be utilized to present a presentation;
- the application program interface comprising:
- a plurality of *open* methods that can be called by an application, the open methods comprising a parameter for specifying a destination for the presentation, and at least a parameter for specify a data source for the presentation; collectively, the parameters for specifying a data source enabling data sources to be specified in different manners, *wherein said one parameter for specifying a data source specifies a topology object that defines transforms to be used in the presentation;*
- a method for ascertaining the state of a media engine that causes the presentation to be presented;
- a method for ascertaining capabilities of the media engine;
- a plurality of methods for providing presentation control;
- a method that provides access to metadata associated with the presentation;
- a method that provides access to statistics associated with the presentation;
- an event generator interface for generating events associated with the presentation;
- a stream selector interface that provides methods for setting stream selection modes; and

- a media session interface that provides methods that enable the media engine to configure a media session for a presentation.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office argues that the subject matter is anticipated by Sullivan. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance, this claim has been amended.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Sullivan or Ogino disclose or suggest a "plurality of *open* methods ... the open methods comprising a parameter for ... specifying a data source for the presentation ... wherein said one parameter for specifying a data source specifies a *topology object* that defines *transforms* to be used in the presentation", as recited in Applicant's claim (emphasis added). During the above-referenced interview, the Office agreed that neither reference discloses or suggests such an element. Applicant once again thanks the Office for its input.

For at least this reason, this claim stands allowable.

Claim 47 recites a system comprising (emphasis added):

- one or more computer-readable media;
- an application program interface embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and which can be utilized to present a presentation;
- the application program interface comprising:
- an *open* method that can be called by an application, the open method comprising a parameter for specifying a *topology object* that defines *transforms* to be used in the presentation.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Sullivan or Ogino teach or suggest a "an *open* method that can be called by an application, the open method

comprising a parameter for specifying *a topology object* that defines *transforms* to be used in the presentation”, as recited in Applicant’s claim (emphasis added). During the above-referenced interview, the Office agreed that neither reference teaches or suggests such an element. Applicant once again thanks the Office for its input.


For at least this reason, this claim stands allowable.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 10-5-2007

By: 
David W. Foster
Reg. No. 60,902
(509) 324-9256 ext 219